

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/733,246	SERIZAWA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Hai C. Pham	2861	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Hai C. Pham. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Michael Britton, Attorney. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 18 February 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kramer (U.S. 4,826,268) , Matsushita (U.S. 6,411,325).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative argues that Kramer shows a beam detecting unit being mounted on the optical housing but does not explicitly teach the provision of the intermediate member supporting the beam detecting unit. Applicant's Representative further argues that Matsushita does not teach the thermal expansion coefficient of the mounting part being compared to that of the optical housing as recited in the base claims. The examiner indicates that he will further analyse the cited prior art and update the search as needed..

HCP

2/18/06